

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

9

DANIEL CLARK SUMMERS,  
Petitioner,

10

v.

11

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Respondent.

12

Case No. C05-5415FDB

13

ORDER DENYING 2255 MOTION  
AND DISMISSING CAUSE OF  
ACTION

14

Following a jury trial, Petitioner was convicted on all counts (felon in possession of a firearm and possession of an illegal weapon). Petitioner bases his motion of *United States v. Booker*, 125 S. Ct. 738 (2005). Title 28 U.S.C. § 2255 provides a one-year statute of limitations for motions for collateral relief. The one-year period runs from the latest of “the date on which the judgment of conviction becomes final” or “the date on which the right asserted was initially recognized by the Supreme Court, if that right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review[.]” *Id.* at ¶ 6.

15

The judgement of conviction became final in this case on February 25, 2002 when the Supreme Court denied certiorari. Petitioner filed his motion on June 13, 2005 and was, thus, not within the one-year limitations period. The *Booker* decision was announced less than one year

16

17

18

19

ORDER - 1

1 before Petitioner's motion, but there is nothing in the opinion stating that *Booker* is retroactively  
2 applicable to cases on collateral review. This Court has so concluded in previous cases. As the  
3 Court has previously concluded, and as the Government argues herein, a new rule of law is not  
4 generally applied retroactively to criminal cases on collateral review. There are two exceptions, (1)  
5 if the new rule is substantive, affecting the scope of a criminal statute and the underlying conduct that  
6 constitutes a violation of that statute; or (2) if the new rule is deemed a "watershed" rule of criminal  
7 procedure implicating fundamental fairness. The decision in *Booker*, which effectively rendered the  
8 Federal Sentencing Guidelines advisory rather than mandatory, is not a new rule that falls within  
9 either of the exceptions. ACCORDINGLY,

10 IT IS ORDERED: Petitioner's Motion pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 is DENIED and this  
11 cause of action is DISMISSED.

12 DATED this 20<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2005.

13  
14  
15   
16 FRANKLIN D. BURGESS  
17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26